

GRAYSON

E
449
G7



BANCROFT
LIBRARY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA



Grayson, William Johnson

SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH:**A REVIEW OF HAMMOND'S AND FULLER'S LETTERS,**

AND

CHANCELLOR HARPER'S MEMOIR ON THAT SUBJECT,*From the Oct. No. (1845) of the Southern Quarterly.*

AMONG the popular school books, some forty or fifty years ago, was a plain prose edition of Esop's fables. The stories, told in the simplest possible language, were illustrated with wood cuts, very coarse it is true, but sufficiently expressive. One of these represented a naked blackamoor standing in a tub of water. Around him is assembled a group of women—busy bodies in matters not their own—matrons not over attentive to their own households—widows seeking somebody to care about—spinsters anxious for notoriety, and not scrupulous about the means for obtaining it. With much clamor and gossip, and infinite zeal, they are employed; some of them in throwing water on the black; some in scrubbing him with mops and brushes; and the rest in encouraging and directing the efforts of their companions. The labor of love was intended to wash the blackamoor white; it ended, as Esop tells us, in the death of the favored party. During the progress of the experiment, the ladies, no doubt, discussed the certainty of its success; the benevolence of their own motives; the folly and malice of those, who refused to believe that black could be made white; and the advantages of amalgamation with the interesting patient, when the process of regeneration should be over.

Esop's benevolent women were the prototypes of the present abolitionists, or *ablutionists*. These also are busy with their tub and blackamoor. Mr. Jay plies his mop, and Tappan his bucket, and John Quincy Adams his newly invented scrubbing brush—the right of petition—with exemplary vigor, whilst Alvan Stewart, and Cassius M. Clay, stand by in delirious ecstasy, and the Trollopes, Martineaus, and Abby Kellys, with all the abolition matrons and maidens of blushing New-England, are earnest and eloquent on the necessity and benefits of immediate amalgamation. The zeal of these modern transmuters of races and colors, is not only as warm and clamorous as that of their predecessors, but promises the same result to the object of their affection.

If the operators could confine their experiment to subjects among themselves, the Southern people would neither complain nor interfere. We should feel some sympathy for the poor black, and some wonder at the crazy white, but there is no Paul Pryism in the character of the South, and we would leave our neighbors of old, or New-England, to conduct their own affairs in their own way. Indeed we are so far acquainted with the ethics of fanaticism, and have so much charity for folly, as to be willing to excuse the abolitionists, if they should occasionally steal from the Southern States a negro or two for their experiments, as they often do, when their prisons and penitentiaries have absorbed their own—it would be unreasonable to require that a fanatic should be able to respect the rights of property, or that a party should acknowledge the obligations imposed by the decalogue, who virtually reject the authority of the Old and New Testaments.

Slavery in the South.

But these good people are not content to indulge their whims within their own limits, or, to any moderate extent, at our expense. They have a perfect mania for the tub and scrubbing brush, and cannot be satisfied without thrusting them into the Southern States, and experimenting among us upon our slaves. We have, therefore, been compelled, from time to time, to tell them, in very plain terms, that we have no faith in their wisdom or their motives; that their passion for intermeddling in what does not concern them, has nothing in common with the pure and noble sentiment of christian benevolence, which is incompatible with any thing malevolent or vindictive; that it is in truth the offspring of inordinate vanity, the love of excitement, or the bastard ambition, which seeks power by other than the ordinary and legitimate modes. When, in the pursuit of their object, they send agents among us to amend our laws, we dismiss them with as much civility as the case permits. When they abuse the common council room of the nation to annoy the South, we are constrained to let them know that their agitation in Congress is a faithless violation of rights guaranteed by the Constitution, and which honest and honorable men could not fail to respect—very moderate language, and altogether short of a just description of that arrogant and insolent surveillance over the social condition of the Southern States, established and kept up by societies and associations at the North, under the pitiful pretence of a right to discuss, or a right to petition, or benevolence, or religion, or some other glossing falsehood.

But the people of the Southern States have never formally vindicated, until lately, the rightfulness, advantages, and necessity of slavery, as established among us. Some have thought it idle to reason with fanatics, and others have been averse to the excitement to which such a discussion might possibly lead, or, perhaps, they have distrusted the strength of their own position; whatever the reason may have been, they have abstained from any discussion of the subject when it was possible to avoid it. But a change is perceptible in the Southern States. The perpetual din of the Northern and European press, has roused the attention of our people. It is proper that it should do so. Continued attacks unmet, arguments unanswered, misrepresentation unexplained, and falsehoods unbranded, may produce evil consequences even among ourselves. It is due, therefore, even to our own people, to look the subject fairly in the face, to lay aside all scruple, and to challenge investigation. It is due also to those of the Northern States—composing by far the greater number of their people—who are not abolitionists, and who need information on a subject of which they have no personal knowledge. The pamphlets at the head of our article, will show that certain distinguished and able men at the South have come to this conclusion; the execution of them proves that it has been from no lack of logic or wit, that the *amis des noirs* had so long remained unanswered.

The South is indebted, we believe, to Professor Dew, for the first clear and comprehensive argument on the subject of slavery. In a review of the debates in the Virginia Convention, he has produced an argument on the subject, which a distinguished judge pronounces to be the most able and philosophic that he has met with in our time. He was followed by Chancellor Harper, who, in the year 1836, delivered an oration, and in 1837, read a memoir on the same subject, before the Literary and Philosophical Society of South-Carolina. He takes the broad ground that slavery cannot be proven to be a moral, political, or social evil, or to be incompatible with a well regulated and happy civil polity. To those who have the happiness to know Chancellor Harper; the purity of his life; the fairness of his mind; the simplicity of his character; his love for truth; his devotion to knowledge; the exactness of his taste; and the force and compass of his intellect; it need hardly be said, that whatever he writes is worthy of serious attention, not only for the ability which it must exhibit, but because it comes from a man of wisdom and virtue, the business of whose life is the conscientious and earnest seeking after truth. The Chancellor has been followed by Dr. Cartwright, the Rev. Dr. Fuller, and Governor Hammond, who have discussed the subject, in its several relations, with great ability.* Dr. Cartwright's article, in a former number of this review, is exceedingly ingeni-

* See also an able argument in the 3d No. of the Southern Review.

ous and interesting, and well deserves a careful perusal. Governor Hammond's letters are in every body's hands, they have been published in various forms, and a large number of the pamphlet edition has been sent to England for circulation. They are written in that discursive but popular form, with intermingled logic, wit, and sarcasm, which commands the public favor, and gives them the best possible quality for a book, that of being, like Randolph's speeches, readable by every body. We shall attempt to give a concise summary of the arguments of some of these gentlemen.

The first topic that meets us, in their discussion of the question of slavery, is a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*, as far as England and the North are concerned. The impugnors of slavery and slaveholders in America, are the very people by whom slaves and slaveholders were established there. The capital which, in New-England, is now invested in presses and print shops for the slander of the slaveholder; for enticing negroes to fly from their masters; for cramming runaway negro orators to rival Birney and Tappan; for paying small traffickers in philanthropy to sneak into Southern families, and chronicle lies in the intervals of fawning and feeding, was invested a few years ago in transporting negroes from Africa.* Being compelled by law to abandon the old trade of making the black a slave, the business men have taken up the new one of making him free. If the law permitted a return to the former traffic, there is no doubt that both branches of the concern would be carried on with equal activity. Even now, the law to the contrary notwithstanding, according to the report of an American officer on the African station, Northern merchants furnish vessels and merchandize to the slavers on the coast of Africa, and in this manner facilitate the trade in slaves. But this, by no means, conflicts with the abolitionists' carrying on the trade of emancipation. It is quite possible, indeed, that the same parties may be active in both departments, and that Mr. Tappan may do a turn of business in making bond, as well as making free. It is of little moment to these revilers of their own countrymen, that all such libellers as they are, belong to the proverbially respectable order of evil birds who befool their own nests. To the hunter after notoriety, or money, the cleanliness of the field is of small importance, or consideration. He is like the Roman emperor, who could find no unsavoury smell in the gold derived from the filthiest object of taxation.

To this *argumentum ad hominem* the people of England are even more exposed, than our own countrymen. If individuals and nations are responsible for the necessary consequences of their acts, then is England responsible for slavery in the United States. For more than a century, the English merchants carried on in this country, an extensive commerce in negro slaves. They bought them in Africa, transported them to America, and sold them to the planters, for large sums of money. Now a new fashion prevails, and the good people of England form societies, establish presses, and circulate books, pamphlets, and tracts, to revile the planters for holding the very slaves, which English capital, English ships, and English merchants purchased, transported, and sold among them. Into this new current of national opinion all classes have fallen; from the Irish demagogue, to the English Duke; from Mrs. Martineau, to the Scotch ex-Chancellor; from Dickens—the incarnation of Cockney sentiment—to the Queen's consort, who spares an hour, occasionally, from nursing the numerous buds of the illustrious white and red rose of York and Lancaster, to extend his care to the negro across the Atlantic. In this war upon a system of their own making, the English people as is common with them, have no selfish design whatever—no intermeddling disposition to supervise the concerns of America,† Cuba, or Brazil. They do not make it a pretext for overhauling the vessels of other nations, and promoting their claim to supremacy on the ocean. They cover under it no sly

* Even the clergy took part in the slave trade speculation. Dr. Stiles sent a barrel of rum to Africa to purchase a negro; and, in due time, as Dr. Wayland tells us, the Reverend trader received a well-conditioned negro boy.

† We say America for the United States. It is the proper name of the United States. In Europe, by America, they mean the United States: by Americans, they mean the citizens of the United States. Other parts of the continent have different names: Mexico, Brazil, Chili. America is appropriated by us. To attempt to substitute for it Alleghania, etc., is both unnecessary and ridiculous.

scheme for rebuilding their colonial prosperity, and correcting the blunders of their West India policy, by checking, in other countries, the growth of those productions which she has virtually abandoned, by the abolition of slavery in her own. Nothing like it—they are actuated by the purest benevolence only—their captains of slavers have all been converted into Howards, and have exchanged their zeal for making slaves, into an equal zeal for making freemen.

From their anxiety to take care of the poor of other nations, it might be naturally inferred that they have none at home—no rags, no wretchedness unequalled in any other country; no filthy hovels with mud floors, the common abode of pigs, poultry, and peasant; no crowded cellars, where families occupy each its corner; no millions of paupers never fed, never clothed, never warmed in winter; no children put to hard labor below ground; no girls at work among naked men; no examples of human degradation and suffering more brutal than any American imagination, unassisted by British Parliamentary Reports, could possibly conceive. Nothing of all this can exist in England. The Parliamentary Reports must be false. If true, would not English hearts and hands be first and exclusively devoted to extirpate so horrible a condition of society?—would they write, declaim, expend thousands on a supposed abuse three thousand miles off, with which they have no connection, civil, social, or political, and of which they know little or nothing, whilst the horrors of their own hearths continue to cry to heaven for redress? Would they pass by their fellow-subjects dying of hunger on their very door sills, to make long prayers in the market place for the sufferers of the negro, who never knows what hunger is.

But if British philanthropy is resolved to look over and beyond their own homeless, unfed, ragged millions, and expend its unsought sympathy on other nations, it is suggested to Mr. Clarkson, with all due respect, to pursue the only course by which his end can be accomplished. His countrymen brought the negro here, let them take him away. They are in possession of the millions for which they sold him, let them use the money to buy them. They may purchase as any body else may purchase. They may carry their property where they please, as other owners do. But they have never done this. They have never released from slavery a single slave, by the only possible mode by which they can release him. It is far more agreeable to the system by which they combine the pleasures of charity and gain, to hold great meetings at Exeter Hall; to boast of English philanthropy and liberty; to issue circulars full of self-complacency and self-gratulation, thanking that they are not as other men—slave-holders, and man-stealers—and to continue, with their hands in their breeches pockets, to jingle the very gold for which they sold the African savage, kidnapped by their ship-masters on the coast of Guinea. This negro trade has been invaluable to our English friends. It first filled their purses with an immense amount of money, and now it affords a capital, on which their traders in philanthropy, as Coleridge calls them, carry on a large and profitable business. Being no longer able to coin money out of slavery, they now turn it to another account, and make it a reputation-for-humanity fund. They manage to earn a character for hating slavery out of the very plantations in America, which they themselves stocked with slaves. They contrive, from the same quarter, at the same time, to obtain credit for benevolence, and cotton for their Manchester trade. They are like their Bishop of London, who declaims, before the House of Lords, on the debaucheries of the age, and rents out the very stews in which they flourish; securing a subject for his moral lecture on licentiousness, by providing tenements for those who indulge in it. They resemble their own beau ideal of a fine gentleman—George the IV.—who drove his wife into imprudencies by his brutality and neglect, and persecuted her to death for having fallen into them;—or, one of the fashionable Whartons of the London Clubs, who seduces a woman, and then upbraids her with a want of virtue. The case is even worse, as violation is worse than seduction, for John Bull forced the colonies to do, what he now abuses them for having done.

This knack in our old friend, of reconciling the propensities first for getting money, and next for making rhetorical flourishes about his benevolence, is not confined to American slavery. It is quite as conspicuous, and amusing in other matters—for example, in his East India affairs.

For many years the gold and jewels of Hindostan continued to flow into England without interruption. During half a century, not a ship arrived from Calcutta, which did not bring with it some nabob returning with his chests of gold and diamonds, the plundered treasure of Begums and Rajahs, hoarded from generation to generation, for centuries. When Clive was accused of rapacity, he burst into an exclamation, that so far from being guilty, he looked back with astonishment at his own moderation when he remembered how he walked in the treasury of Moorshedabad, between heaps of gold and precious stones, his will being the only limit to his power. Clive had few equals. There were not many of the Company's servants who left themselves, under similar circumstances, the same cause for astonishment. Pennyless writers who went to India with small salaries, in a few years returned, to buy manors, surpass the aristocracy in profusion and ostentation, and rival princes in their expenditure.

But whilst the whole nation were eagerly rushing to this harvest of "barbaric pearl and gold," they got up, to balance the account, the most magnificent indignation-meeting that the world has ever seen. Hastings, the Governor-General of India, was arraigned in Westminster Hall. Ladies, and Lords, and Commons—all that England possessed of beauty, and talent, and noble birth—were assembled, day after day, to hear the denunciations of an eloquence never surpassed, perhaps never equalled—to listen, with wonder, to the vehement logic of Fox, the sparkling declamation of Sheridan, the gorgeous imagination of Burke, luxuriating in kindred themes of Eastern character and scenery. The effect on the female audience was terrific—one fainted, another was carried out in hysterics. But time passed on; the ladies became weary, or found something more attractive in the opera, or the play; the counsel flagged; every thing grew tired but the hatred of Francis, and the ardour of Burke; the trial closed, and the enemy of Cheyte Sing and Nuncomar retired from the bar of the Senate to purchase an estate, and enjoy a pension. We are not to suppose that, during all this time, there was one rupee less taken from the plundered Indian. The grand-national-sympathy-meeting vindicated the British character for humanity, and the Company's servants took care to gratify the national passion for wealth. One incident occurred, during the grand exhibition of benevolence and justice by the British Parliament, which sufficiently explains the nature of the show. Mr. Martin, an honest country member, very deeply affected by the eloquent account of the wrongs done to the Indian Princesses, got up and declared, in his simplicity, that if any member would move to restore the treasures of which the Princesses had been plundered, he would second the motion. He looked round for support; but not a voice was heard; not a man was found to make the motion, and the honest countryman discovered, that restoration of the stolen property was not the policy of the receivers of stolen goods, however eloquent they may be in denouncing the thief.

The East India company have shown a very happy conformity to the national character, in their transactions of commerce and conquest, "always," says a distinguished English writer, "protesting against adding a foot to their territory, and denouncing the policy which extended it, while they quietly take possession, without a murmur, of the gains thus acquired; at once relieving their conscience by the protest, and replenishing their purses by the spoil."*

The war in China furnishes another happy exemplification of the manner in which the British combine the love of gain, and a benevolent regard to the happiness of their neighbors. They waged war on the poor Celestials, battered down their forts, stormed their towns, butchered the almost unresisting people like sheep, not for conquest, or commerce only, but for the advancement of the christian religion, and the amelioration of the Chinese moral and religious character. They fought at once for the extension of trade, and of true religion, and made converts with the same zeal to the use of Opium, and the New Testament.

There can be no doubt that the business part of the transaction was a fair one, because it has been justified by the casuist of Quincy, who thinks it horrible to whip a delinquent negro with a lash, but very commendable to poison the Chinese with

*Brougham.

opium. The Hong Kong Gazette announces that the trade has fully succeeded; that opium is now eaten by the Celestials without opposition, or enquiry, on the part of their government; and the London papers announce the arrival of the last two millions of sycee silver. Whether the philanthropic part of the undertaking is equally successful, we are not yet informed.

This amiable and benevolent desire to promote the happiness of the whole human race, so conspicuously exhibited in the censure of slavery, the conquest of India, and the improvement of China, has alone induced the people of England to appropriate to themselves endless possessions in all parts of the globe. In addition to India, with its hundred millions, they possess New-Holland, and the Cape of Good Hope, and Gibraltar, and Canada, and parts of South America and Africa, and countless islands in every ocean and sea. This certainly, to a careless observer, seems to indicate a grasping and greedy spirit in the English people, but then, *per contra*, to demonstrate their moderation, they show a most laudable zeal for the independence of Texas, and denounce the rapacity of the United States in seeking, or desiring its annexation. They exhibit an equal zeal to save Oregon from the ambition of America, and are even willing to take it themselves, worthless as they say the country is, rather than see it fall into the hands of the unprincipled republicans. In this way England reconciles, to her own satisfaction, the passion for acquisition, and the profession of moderation, and is at once most insatiable in her own acquisitions, and most censorious on those of other nations. One of her writers is now recommending the seizure of Egypt. If she takes it, the occupation will be accompanied with endless declarations, that it is intended for the benefit of the world in general, and for the religious, moral, and civil improvement of the Egyptians in particular, and for no other purpose. We are told of a Benedictine who boasted or confessed, that his vow of poverty had secured to him an income of 100,000 crowns, his vow of humility had clothed him with princely dignities, and his vow of chastity had produced effects equally surprising and agreeable. The English professions of generosity, magnanimity, and moderation, have led to consequences quite as singular, unexpected, and edifying.

We have been puzzled to understand how it is, that England should be not only blameless, but praiseworthy, in seizing upon India with one hundred millions of inhabitants, and that America should be unprincipled and ambitious, in adding certain vacant territory to her possessions. The fact must be so, for all England affirms it to be so. It is perhaps the only point on which the English and Irish agree, and about which Mr. O'Connell does not pronounce the Premier a dealer in falsehoods. It is true, that there are some differences in our proceedings and theirs. We appropriate a country by purchase, they by conquest; we with the consent of the inhabitants, they without it; we deal in resolutions, conventions, constitutions, they in flying artillery, and sharp pointed bayonets; we annex a few thousand *new citizens*, and many acres of revenueless country, they millions of *new subjects*, and countless lacs of contributions. It must be these differences that make the objection to us. Our mode of acquisition is not that which is recognized in monarchical and aristocratic Europe, and, therefore, not the legitimate mode. We presume to differ with Kings, in obtaining increase of territory by peaceable means, and not by glorious war, and are therefore unprincipled republicans—uninstructed in the true royal doctrines, which direct acquisitions of territory to be made by violence only, and justify such acts even as the attack on Denmark, provided it be attended with a sufficient destruction of human life. Tested by these royal maxims, the annexation of Ireland was originally a wise and just measure, and ought to be adhered to, because it was accomplished in spite of the Irish, and with an abundant shedding of Irish blood; but the annexation of Texas is an act of unprincipled ambition and rapacity, because it was done with the consent of every Texan man, woman, and child—an independent people by the admission and recognition of England and France. It arises, no doubt, from this legitimate mode of annexation applied by England to Ireland, that there exists between the two countries a love and esteem so cordial, as to excite universal admiration. No two nations in the world, neither Italians and Germans, nor Turks and Greeks, nor Russians and Poles—another example of the royal mode of annexation—feel for each other so much affectionate solicitude, or dwell together like breth-

ren, in such perfect unity. We are content, however, with our plain republican way of doing these things; and imitating, as we do, our worthy progenitor, in the determined spirit for making acquisitions, we prefer our American mode by purchase, and consent of parties, to the Irish plan of England.

There is no hypocrisy in all this assumption of humanity and disinterestedness, by the British people. The Englishman really persuades himself that he makes war for the advantage of every body but himself; that he conquers Hindostan to rescue the Indians from despotism, storms Canton for the comfort of Counsellor Lin, and seizes upon countless islands and countries, to give lessons of moderation and disinterestedness to the whole family of mankind. There is nothing so monstrous that an Englishman is not ready to believe it, if it be flattering to the pride of England. On this subject his self-deception is without limit; all contradiction, inconsistency, or absurdity is overlooked, or never seen, if the statement be in praise of English courage, good faith, or humanity. In a work lately published—the *Crescent and the Cross*—Mr. Elliott Warburton very gravely tells us that England, alone, carried on war for twenty years on the whole world, for that world's liberty. But no, he adds, she was not alone—she had *one* ally in this struggle for religion and freedom. In the great battle for the christian faith, and civil liberty, the Turk—the successor of the Mahomets and Amuraths—the representative of the bowstring and Koran—made common cause with English bayonets and Bibles, to defend the freedom and faith of the infidel dogs, whose father's graves the Moslem are accustomed to defile. This was indeed a miracle of English diplomacy; and it may certainly be admitted, that the defence of religion and the civil liberty of the whole world, was quite as much the real object of the Turk, as of the Englishman.

The same writer delights in denouncing the French atrocities in Egypt, and elsewhere. No tale on this subject is incredible to him. In a few pages after, he describes an inundation produced by the British army having cut the great dam separating the salt-water lake Maadee from lake Mareotis, by which fifty Arab villages were swept away, and a country fertile until visited by its English allies, was converted into a swamp. The author adds, that Mehemet Ali intends to drain the lake, and to restore it to cultivation; but, he coolly remarks, "many years will be required to repair the ruin which a few hours were sufficient to effect." If this had been done by the French brigands, we should never hear the last of it. But, it being an exploit of British troops, there are, without doubt, forty excellent reasons why they should do it, —one perhaps being, that they went to Egypt to defend and protect the inhabitants from the horrors of French domination.

This gentle and considerate mode of dealing with the lives and property of their allies by a British army, so sensibly felt by their Turkish or Egyptian friends, was shown even more emphatically to the Spaniards, during the Peninsular War. The inhabitants of St. Sebastian, Ciudad Rodrigo, and Badajos, filled Europe with complaints of the rapine, house-burning, rape, and murder, consequent upon the storming of those places by the British troops, and Napier admits their complaint to be well founded. But what then?—is it reasonable to require soldiers to discriminate so nicely, as to distinguish between a friend's city held against his consent by an enemy, and a city of the enemy himself, or to consider them, when taken by storm, as entitled to any difference of treatment? Besides this, was not the army of England doing battle for the civil liberty and the religion of the whole world, and surely they are not to be judged by the common standard of humanity and morals, which may be supposed to regulate a more ordinary warfare.

If, however, after all, any man should be so unreasonable and impracticable, as to entertain doubts respecting the benevolence and philanthropy of the British nation, and to be dissatisfied with the evidence in their favor, exhibited so forcibly by the anti-slavery doings of the great English traders in negroes—by their impeaching the plunderer, Hastings, but refusing to restore the stolen goods—by their forcing the trade in opium on the Chinese at the point of the bayonet, to give the tea-drinking Celestials another agreeable stimulant, and so improve their moral and religious character; by their peculiar mode of dealing with the dykes and cities of their allies, when under the protection of a British force—we would refer any such unbeliever:

to the domestic history of Great Britain, as proving conclusively the humanity of her people. Let him advert to their punishments, amusements, and civil wars—the three great tests of the temper and disposition of a nation—and he can no longer fail to acknowledge the gentleness of the national character. Take their punishments for example,—chopping off heads with axes; dismembering the dead body of the criminal; sticking up the limbs over gateways; gibbeting in chains; killing by law for the theft of a shilling; imprisoning and starving for debt; transporting for shooting a hare; or their amusements, so particularly humane—seeing men beat each other to mummies; bull-baiting; dog-worrying; cock-fighting, where the death of the bird is ensured by steel weapons; tearing foxes to pieces with hounds; steeple-chasing, where the poor horse is often killed, to say nothing of the benevolent gentleman who rides him; and the love of coarse practical jokes, which the taste and delicacy of Marryatt so delight in describing; or their civil conflicts—*so marked by forbearance and humanity*—from the war of the roses, to Cromwell's gentle dealing with the royalist Catholics, or Lauderdale's tender mercies to the rebel Scotch Presbyterian, or North's Indian allies in our own revolution, the employment of whom Lord Chatham so strangely thought a disgrace to the ancestry of British soldiers and nobles.

To these excellencies of the English character, so prominently exhibited in their disinterested wars and acquisitions for the good of mankind, there may be added an amiable passion for libelling their neighbors. For many centuries the French enjoyed a Benjamin's portion of the good things that flow from the insular spleen. The frog-eating, wooden shod, attenuated Gaul, was a standing dish for the fun of the pury Saxon. Even the Gallic courage was held cheap, and it became a test of British patriotism to believe, that one Englishman could whip three Frenchmen. The subjects of the Grand Monarque bore the incessant barking of their neighbor with great equanimity, and politely ascribed his ill nature to his climate, as Rosseau laid his own insanity when in England on the "climat D'Angleterre." They thought it not surprising that men, who were always hanging themselves, should be always abusing other people.

But for some years past, the United States appear to have become the favored nation. We have utterly eclipsed the French in sharing the civilities of the English press and people. Their favorite topic now is, the unprincipled, irreligious, profligate, spitting, tobacco chewing, julip drinking, drawling, lounging, unmannerly American. They roll the subject, like a sweet morsel, under their tongues. They have an affection for it. They place it in all kinds of lights. It assumes the shape of travels in this country. It makes a favorite article in the reviews. It enlivens a leader in the Times or Chronicle. It gives poignancy to a speech in Parliament. It is the staple of the Exeter love meetings, and helps out the scurrility of the corn Exchange. They are never weary of it. Ah, if they could only, really, and in truth, bring themselves to believe in their sayings—if they could but persuade themselves to have faith in their own invectives—to credit their own assertion, that America has neither men, nor money, nor intelligence, nor power; what comfort it would be to our English kin, how calmly and contentedly they would dream over a future of undisputed dominion on every shore. But unfortunately for their happiness, they do not believe one word of the speculations of a traveller, reviewer, orator or editor. They have no genuine faith in the speedy downfall of the Great Republic, whose existence "with fear of change perplexes monarchs." They know that their abuse and misrepresentations are all fudge, and they are the more exasperated for knowing it. They feel, that all their invective notwithstanding, America will go on in her gigantic race, growing every day in population, wealth and power. They predict the speedy dissolution of her government, and have done so for fifty years, but are the most unfortunate of all prophets. They neither believe themselves, nor are believed in by others. It is very much to be lamented. We pity the unhappy patient, but know no remedy, unless it be a course of anti-bilious medicines, and abstinence from pen and ink. But if his convalescence depends on the stopping, or retarding America in her advance to a power, which will defy all attacks or interference, the case is hopeless.

One of the most prominent points in the abuse of the Americans at present is their

frauds—the failure to pay their debts. There is nothing of which the Englishman is so intolerant as a non-punctual debtor. In his own country he hunts the poor devil with bailiffs, as he does a hare with hounds, and to a foreign delinquent his anger is ferocious. This is all very well, we have not a word to say for the knaves who repudiate. Let them be roasted by the Quarterly, or by any of the scurrilous scribblers, who, like Dickens and Marryatt, may be paying off old scores by libels on the United States. But it would be as well for the good people of England to remark, that Pennsylvania is not America—that most of the States never failed to pay their debts—that many of them have none to pay—that the American Government has paid interest and principal—that England's bankruptcy, hopeless and irretrievable, awaits a revulsion only in her Eastern Empire—that “trades proud empire hastes to swift decay,” is a truth not taught by her own poet only, but by the experience of all ages—heat there is no essential difference between the integrity of a people who refuse, or delay to pay their debts, and one which deliberately contracts a debt which renders ultimate insolvency inevitable,—that whatever frauds may at present flourish on either side of the Atlantic, they are only humble imitations of one to which England has had the honor to give birth—the South-sea bubble, “that tremendous hoax,” as Lamb calls it “whose extent the petty speculators of our day look back upon with the same expression of incredulous admiration, and hopeless ambition of rivalry, as would become the puny face of modern conspiracy, contemplating the Titan size of Vaux's superhuman plot;”*—or of another—the suspension of specie payments in 1797—when the pound note sunk to the value of fourteen shillings, and Parliament enacted that it should be regarded as worth twenty, “a gross and revolting absurdity,” says Lord Brougham, *unparalleled in the history of deliberative bodies.*” The consequence of this was, that “the havoc which the depreciation made in the dealings of men was incalculable. Those who had lent their money when the currency was at par, were compelled to receive the depreciated money in payments, and thus loose thirty or forty per cent of their capital. Those who had let land or houses at a lease, must take so much less rent than they had stipulated to receive. Above all, those who had lent their money to the Government, were obliged to take two-thirds only of the interest for which they had bargained, or were liable to be paid off with two-thirds of the principal.”† And this continued for twenty years to be the condition of England so immaculate for honesty.

Indeed at the present moment, the frauds perpetrated under the influence of the existing rail-road mania, are superior to any that we can pretend to produce, and prove conclusively that we are very humble imitators of English excellence. The bubble will burst to the ruin of thousands, and English morality will sit amidst the wreck of their fortunes, and declaim on the cupidity of other nations.

In the face of all this, it is quite ludicrous to see the grave charges brought against America for her exceeding love of the “almighty dollar,” implying, as they do, that the accusers are quite superior to the weakness of attaching any undue value to an object so gross. Why, truly, there never existed a nation where the love of money, or the rage to obtain it, has been more ungovernable than in England—and with reason too, for what is an Englishman, in England, without money? He loses caste. He flies his country. He lives an exile in Belgium, Italy, France, Germany, any where but at home, where his diminished purse would expose him to unendurable scorn from his former equals. What will not gold buy or do in England? For what but the love of it, do the landholders insist on their monopoly of coining money out of the stomachs of the people? In what other region of the globe will the “almighty dollar secure larger indulgence,” to “Ward, to Waters, Chartres, or the Devil?” As to us, it is the standing complaint of English travellers in this country, that even the poor privilege of kicking the waiter, and bullying the landlord, is denied in America, to the possessor of that mighty talisman, which, in England, numbers these enjoyments among the least of its gifts. It is one of the points of inferiority in America, that in this country, the traveller is obliged to be civil to the tavern keeper, and that a full purse confers no right to be insolent or rude even to the coachman of a stage coach.

* Elia

† Lord Brougham.

But we must apologize for this digression on the eccentricities of our English neighbors—his eagerness one day for making the negro a slave, the next for making him free,—his pocketing the spoils, and impeaching the spoilers,—his carrying civilization and religion into foreign lands, by presenting the bible with one hand, and opium with the other. It has proceeded from no want of respect or veneration for our kinsman—quite the reverse. We have for him all the indulgence of a true affection, and admit that he labors under a sort of idiosyncrasy—that the habit of praising himself and abusing others, is what he cannot help—that it is one of his luxuries besides, and it would be as reasonable to expect him to abandon his roast beef, and plum pudding, and pot of London porter—that concentration of all the purities of the Thames—as to forego his favorite enjoyment of libelling his neighbors. We will leave him then to carry on the trade in negroes, on the Eastern shore of Africa, after the old fashion, and on the Western after the new—to make slaves on the one side, and apprentices on the other—while we follow Chancellor Harper and Governor Hammond, in their inquiry into the merits of that slavery, which our English ancestors have established among us.

The subject is one of great magnitude and importance. It presents many questions—all of them interesting—as it is considered in reference to religion, to political economy, to the interests of the master, to those of the slave. Is slavery a sin—does it conflict with the will of God as revealed in the Old and New Testament? Is it the best system for society—for securing the greatest good to the greatest number? Is it in our own country the best system for the master—can he cultivate his lands to better advantage with other labor? Does it most conduce to the welfare of the slave in America—would not liberty be to him a nominal blessing, but a real and insupportable curse? These are the most interesting points from which the subject may be regarded.

Greatly the most important view of the subject is the religious one. For assuredly if slavery be adjudged a sin, if it be condemned by the revealed will of God, then in christendom it cannot continue to exist. It is the duty of every man, making the laws of God the rule of his conduct, to use all practicable efforts to abolish whatever violates them. But it is on this ground, above all others, that the defender of slavery, as we find it among us, is unassailable. It may be asserted with confidence, that there is no fact in history, and no maxim in ethics better established by evidence or argument than the proposition, that slavery was recognized under the Jewish theocracy, and by the christian apostles, as a legitimate form of social life, and that being so recognized, it cannot be deemed a sin by those who take the holy writings, old and new, as the only revealed will of God, and standard of religious and moral duty.

Slaves existed, under the divine government, among the Jewish people. The Scriptures distinctly set forth the rules by which they shall be made, by which they shall be governed, by which they shall be punished. They are described as bought for a price; as the property of their masters; as subject to his will; as beaten with stripes; as marked; as sold; as manumitted; as placed in every possible position, to which the condition of slavery is liable. Slavery then is recognized, permitted, regulated, enjoined, by the Old Testament; but that which is recognized, permitted, regulated, enjoined, by the divine law, cannot be sinful. To assert that it may be, would be maintaining a proposition quite as extravagant, as that two and two make five. Slavery then being so recognized, permitted, regulated and enjoined, can by no possibility be a sin.

Again, when our Saviour taught, slaves where every were about him; he frequently makes allusion to their condition: he denounces every form of sin around him; he reproves Sadducee and Pharisee without scruple, but he uses no expression that can be tortured into a condemnation of slavery.

The apostles were in the midst of slavery in its worst forms and abuses in Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. It could not, therefore, elude their observation. They taught the new converts to christianity, not only the great truths of religion, and the rules of morals, but many minor observances incidental to their situation, many regulations of behaviour, and even of dress becoming their new condition and profession, and rebuked any infringement of them with severity. If slavery were a sin, it could not, therefore escape either their notice, or their condemnation. Far less would this

be possible, if it were the heinous and devilish crime which Mr. Clarkson represents it to be. But there is not in the New Testament a single expression, which even insinuates a condemnation of slavery. Either then slavery is not sin, or the Apostles not only winked at, but wilfully closed their eyes on iniquity of the vilest nature.

Now this is so clear, plain, and conclusive, that to a mind capable of a candid and honest judgment, it is irresistible. Accordingly every christian teacher since the apostolic age, from Chrysostom to Chalmers, who believes that there is meaning in language, or whose opinion is worth a groat, admits that neither the Old or New Testament, contains one word in condemnation of slavery or slaveholders. The great Greek father, commenting on a passage of St. Paul relating to slavery, gives full force to the doctrine of the Apostle in reference to its duties—draws no distinction between his general principles and his particular precepts, as we shall see Dr. Wayland do,—drops no word against slavery, but advises the christian slave to continue in this station, considering his condition as one of the many forms of social life to all which the blessings of gospel truth are alike dispensed. Chalmers admits fully, that slavery is not condemned by the Scriptures, and therefore is not a sin.

But, there is a class of theological instructors, who use the bible not so much to discover truth, as to support previously conceived opinions. They ask, not what St. Paul teaches, but what there is in his teaching to confirm the opinions which themselves entertain. It is Mr. Clarkson that plants, the Apostle only waters. It is Dr. Wayland who builds, Paul and Peter are used to supply materials merely, if they have any, for the work. The disposition to set aside the bible which is commonly imputed to the Church of Rome, may be more fairly ascribed to the class of which we speak. Rome is accused of substituting tradition for the Scriptures, the nominal protestant postpones the gospel to his own system of ethics. If the bible cannot be twisted to go with the system, it is rejected with contempt and abhorrence. "If the religion of Christ, says Dr. Wayland, allows us to take such a license from such precepts as these, the New Testament would be the greatest curse that ever was inflicted on our race." Or, to apply the general remark to the particular case, "if the religion of Christ allows masters to hold slaves—if it permits what Dr. Wayland condemns—the New Testament would be the greatest curse ever inflicted on mankind." Such sentences as these manifestly indicate the temper with which the abolitionists approaches the Scripture argument. It is not one which seeks diligently and humbly to know what the bible teaches, with the resolution to submit to that teaching, whatever it may be. It calls arrogantly and presumptuously on the divine writings to sustain the position of the abolitionist. It searches them merely for weapons of offence against slavery, and if it be once driven to confess that they furnish none, it denounces the book as an imposture and a curse.

The argument of the same parties speak this sentiment also, in a mode more covert, but equally plain. It sets up, as effectually, a standard of right and wrong, independent of the law and the gospel, and supplants the *eternal word* by some crotchety abstract notion of their own. If they do not repudiate the Scriptures in direct terms, they do so indirectly, by undermining their character and authority as the word of God. Take for example, the argument of the President of Brown University in reference to the Old Testament, in answer to Dr. Fuller. Dr. Wayland admits unreservedly that slavery existed in the Jewish nation during the theocracy—that it was not forbidden—that it was regulated by the divine law. Very well, says his opponent, then slavery is not a sin, because a sin is an offence against the revealed will of God, and you grant that slavery is not forbidden by the Old Testament. Not so fast rejoins the worthy President; I admit, it is true, that slavery is permitted by the inspired word of God, but I deny that what is permitted by that word is therefore no sin. Dr. Fuller stands aghast at this, and with uplifted hands, asks his worthy brother of Brown how this can be. Nothing more easy, replies the moral philosopher—other acts are permitted by the Old Testament which are sins—as, for example, polygamy—and, consequently, it does not follow, because a thing is permitted by the divine will, that, therefore, it is not a sin. But, with all due respect to one so high in position as a christian teacher, another conclusion does follow from his position—that the Old Testament permits what is sinful—it follows that the Old Tes-

tament is not the word of that God, who is of purer eyes than *to behold* iniquity, much less to *permit* it—it follows that Dr. Wayland must abandon his bible, or his argument. The most inveterate infidel could not more effectually demolish the authority of the Scriptures, than by proving that they enjoin, or permit a sin.

Thus, either by sentences like the above, or by arguments like the last quoted, the authority of the Old Testament, as the word of God, is annihilated to the mind of the abolitionist, and he comes to regard Moses as an ordinary lawgiver to be judged, with his code, by the unerring ethics of modern presidents of colleges, and professors of moral philosophy. Now, for our part, admitting, as we freely do, that the moral philosophy of the amiable head of Brown University, is a very respectable school book, and vastly superior to the other productions of a like nature, which inundate us from the New-England press, such as the various performances of Peter Parley—of fences, as they are, against the young, fully equal to that of the pedagogue of Falerii, and worthy of the same punishment—yet we are not prepared to abandon even Paley or Smith, or Hutchinson, for Dr. Wayland, and we cannot hesitate to take the Old Testament and slavery, in preference to the “Moral Science” and abolition.

In a manner equally summary, and equally inconsistent with its character as the word of God, Dr. Wayland deals with the New Testament. He admits that it does not condemn slavery. He will not deny that it alludes to slavery as a form of social life—that it regulates the conduct of the slave as a member of the christian church. But, surely what the apostles suffered daily before their eyes without rebuke—what they prescribed rules for—what they therefore permitted, could not be a sin; an enormous sin, as the abolitionists consider it.

The answer of the Clarkson school to this is a singular piece of protestant Jesuitism. True, they say, the apostles did not condemn slavery in their preaching and conversation, but they established, in their writings, certain general principles, which would gradually destroy whatever was inconsistent with christian truth, and they left slavery to the operation of these principles. Now, however proper and necessary a reference to these general doctrines may be, as to abuses which might arise in after times, and of which the apostles knew nothing, who can believe that they were intended as a substitute for their direct condemnation of wrong, and sin committed daily before their eyes? Is there any class afevil doers so high as to escape the censure of Christ and his apostles? The Saviour rebukes the wise and the great, the rich and the powerful, those who sat in Moses' seat. The Apostle Paul denounces idolatry in the midst of Athens and Rome. Is there any thing so minute in the misconduct of christians as to elude their notice? The apostle reproves a departure from propriety in the dress even of the disciples. But there is not a word of condemnation for the sin of slavery—that enormous wrong—that detestable crime. Why is this? It is easy of explanation. The apostle satisfied his conscience by propounding certain doctrines in his writings, which would in time undo the mischief which he himself was inevitably doing, by permitting, by countenancing an offence against God. It is not easy to see after this, with what propriety the apostle could ask the questions,—“thou that preachest a man shall not steal, dost thou steal?”—“thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?”—“thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself.” He might have added—thou that teachest indirectly by general maxims that slavery is sin, dost thou sanction it directly by thy daily conversation and preaching.

The assumption that the apostles thought, or did abstain from censuring any existing vice by direct precepts, and contented themselves with turning it over to the operation of their general principles, is just the reverse of the truth. They give us principles for cases, where they had no opportunity for giving precepts. For what are we now doing when we attempt to apply to any particular case the principles established by the apostles? We merely endeavor to discover what their precepts would have been, if the case had existed in their own day. If slavery had never been known before, and now for the first time, in the progress of missionary labors, the christian preacher had discovered it in some remote tribe or country, the question would naturally arise, whether it was consistent with the principles, the spirit, temper, and scope of the apostolic doctrine; or, in other words, whether the apostles, if now living, would approve or condemn this newly found form of social life. But

there is no room for such enquiries in relation to slavery, when it is admitted that the apostles knew it, saw it, spoke about it. The only proper question then is, what did the apostles speak? Did they condemn it? Suppose that they saw it, and were silent about it. The silence of the apostles is not like the silence of other writers. It means something. In the case supposed it would mean that there was nothing worthy of condemnation. But they were not silent. They prescribed rules for the conduct of the slave; for the conduct of the master. Are we to believe that the apostles regulated a sin?—defined the mode in which it should be indulged? Would not this be approving it? Apply the reasoning to any other sin. Suppose the apostle had written to the Ephesians, giving certain directions as to the manner in which they should offer sacrifice to the great goddess of their temple. Would it be enough to tell us that they had settled certain principles and truths respecting the existence and attributes of the Deity, which would in due time extinguish idolatry. But Dr. Wayland tells us, “we are not competent to decide upon the manner in which God can, or does teach.” It is very possible, therefore, that the apostles may teach one thing by maxims, and another by the tolerance of their daily conversation; that their preaching may lean one way, and their general doctrines another; that their precepts and their principles do not agree; that the first were meant for their own times, and the last for all times after.

We have sometimes heard irreverent wits talk of the difference between the sayings and doings; the theory and practice; the life and preaching of the modern ministers and teachers of divine truth, but we never new the jest to be directed against the Apostle Paul. It remained for the President of Brown University to discover, that the frail bishops and pastors of our own times, may plead the example of the apostles, for the diversity between their principles and their conduct. We have not had the advantage of reading the “moral science,” but we shall take the earliest opportunity of looking for the chapter establishing the rules, by which the balance may be preserved between a divines public teaching, and his private conversation; between his doctrines intended for the world at large, and the precepts which he reserves for his own domestic or social circle; between the right, and the expedient.

But admit that the apostles belong to that class of christian instructors, whose preaching and whose principles are not always in accordance—that, on the subject of slavery, they have refused to rebuke an offence daily before their eyes, and have been content to entrust its removal to the influence of the general doctrines of Scripture. By what authority does Dr. Wayland depart from the apostolic practice?—why does he disregard St. Paul’s example?—the supposed mode of teaching, as to slavery, indirectly by general principles, is what he considers God’s mode of teaching; why does he pursue another? He admits that there is not one word in the New Testament condemning slavery; why are there so many pages in Dr. Wayland’s writings? Whence this contrariety between the president and the apostle? We are assured, with all imaginable dogmatism, that slavery is a sin. Why is it?—have Christ or the apostles said so?—no, but Mr. Tappan and Mr. Birney have. It is a wrong. Do the Scriptures condemn it?—no, but Dr. Wayland, President of Brown University does. It ought to be abolished. Does St. Paul teach this?—not a word like it, but Mr. Clarkson has issued his bulls to that effect, of a breed quite as formidable as those of Lord Peter in the tale of a tub. Will christians in their senses hesitate between St. Paul and Mr. Clarkson, or Dr. Wayland, or Mr. Birney?—certainly they will. The Northern Methodist Church, the Northern Baptist Church, all the dreamers of dreams, and seers of visions, and appealers to moral codes purer than that of the bible, turn their backs on St. Paul, and kick the Old and New Testament into the kennel, as a curse. The continued existence of the christian religion, such professed friends as these notwithstanding, is, perhaps, the most striking evidence of its divine origin. If, as we have heard a friend remark, a fortress is assailed from without, and is undermined within by treacherous defenders, and still from the ramparts the standard continues to fly year after year, who can resist the conviction, that a power more than human defends and protects its walls?

The substance then of Dr. Wayland’s argument is this. It is true that slavery was permitted by the Old Testament, but that does not prove that slavery is no sin,

because other sins were permitted by the Old Testament. It is true that there is not a word in the New Testament condemning slavery, but that is because the apostles determined that the best mode of rebuking this sin, was to say nothing against it—to regulate the mode in which it should be indulged—to leave it to the general spirit of christianity to abolish the evil. It is not, Dr. Wayland adds, for man to ask why the apostles pursued this way of teaching in reference to slavery. It is enough that it is God's way. But in our day, the apostolic, or God's manner of teaching, is no longer the right one. The abolitionists—Mr. Clarkson, Dr. Wayland,—have changed all that. They have grown wiser than St. Paul, and have been blessed with a new revelation like the Mormon. The apostles said not a word in censure of slavery or slaveholders; the abolitionists rail at them like fishwomen—St. Paul regulates the duty of master to slave, and of slave to master; Dr. Wayland denies that any such relation can properly exist—the apostle restores to the master the runaway slave, the abolitionists entice the slave to runaway—the first, directs the believing slave to continue in his condition, to be content, to regard himself and master as equally the servants of Christ, and equally bound by the duties of their several stations; the last, counsels, discontent, hatred, disobedience, and revolt,—the one addresses the owner of slaves as a beloved brother; the other reviles him as a miscreant. It is evident that we must choose between St. Paul and Dr. Wayland. It is not possible to serve two such masters.

On this branch of the subject—the relation of slavery to religion—we cannot too highly commend the argument of Dr. Fuller. It is clear, acute, and unanswerable. His opponent, in attempting to reply, loses himself in a mist of metaphysical subtleties, like one of Homer's heroes, whose exploits were suddenly cut short by a fog. We hope that the worthy President of Brown, like the Greek hero, will have sense and piety enough to pray for light, and not go on vainly to do battle in the dark.

There are some little things that we could wish amended in Dr. Fuller's letters. He is a strong and skilful disputant, but a somewhat incautious one. We do not understand why slavery *should not continue to be possible*, when for four thousand years it has been actual, or why its continuance *should not be desirable*, when, as regards the black, it is a choice between servitude and extinction. We could wish too for a little pruning of his excessive deferences and solicitudes for his reverend brother, and that he had been a little more chary of promoting untried books to the dignity of classical standards. But we know the kindly humor from which this comes, and that he could not possibly break his worthy brother's head even sylogistically, without an affectionate solicitude to apply a plaster to the wound. We notice the slight defects, only because the letters are so excellent, as to make us desire to see them without a fault.

The Southern States then have nothing to apprehend in discussing the question of slavery, as connected with the religion of the bible. For those other religions, which virtually repudiate the bible, whether they go by the name of Mormonism, or abolitionism, or assume the garb of some refined system of ethics, transcending the morals of the apostles, we have no concern. They will perish and come to naught, like a thousand fanatical follies which have gone before them.

Slavery, in its relation to political economy, presents the next important question connected with it. Is it better for the whole community, including both master and slave—the entire body politic, or State—that predial and domestic slavery should, or should not, exist? Does it secure the greatest good to the greatest number? This is the question, as Chancellor Harper propounds it. He adds, "let me not be understood as taking upon me to determine, that it is better that it should exist. God forbid that the responsibility of deciding such a question should be thrown on me, or my countrymen. But this I will say, and not without confidence, that it is in the power of no human intellect to establish the contrary proposition;—the proposition, that it is better it should not exist. This is probably known to but one Being, and is concealed from human sagacity." Chancellor Harper then goes into a clear, comprehensive, philosophical argument, which even an opponent, if he be an ingenuous one, must admire. Slavery, he says, has existed in all ages, and in almost all nations. It has been the instrument for the promotion of civilization every where. In no country, have the

arts or improvements of society flourished or advanced, but by the aid of slavery. The savage will not labor: War, the chase, an indolent sensuality divide his life. This condition of society endures as long as the barbarian continues to put his prisoners to death. When he ceases to amuse himself after a victory, by making riddles of his captives with arrows, or tearing their flesh with pincers, or dashing out their brains with a tomahawk, and discovers that he can make them *contribute to his wants by preserving their lives*, then improvement commences. The continuous, systematic, persevering labor of the prisoner, converted into a slave, produces food, comforts, conveniences, luxuries. The roaming savage becomes fixed. Agriculture advances; the arts appear, and are cultivated, and society gradually, but certainly, assumes the form of civilized life. This is the history of progress among all nations. Slavery is the instrument, the means, by which the barbarian reaches the advantages of civilization. In warm countries, it is impossible, perhaps, after attaining them, to perpetuate them by any other other means. Compulsory labor is the only labor which can be sufficiently depended on, to counteract the influence of a hot climate. A tropical sun at once produces an indisposition to work, and supplies without it, all that is necessary for sustaining life. In severer climates where the danger of freezing, and starving, and the absolute necessity of shelter, are sufficiently compulsory, without the help of a master's control, a new modification of social life arises, and a different condition of society is gradually established. Servitude takes the place of slavery. The hired laborer supersedes the slave. But it is by no means certain, that this change is for the benefit of the last.

In the progress of that state of society, to which we have just adverted, population increases; labor becomes superabundant. It is discovered that the work of the slave no longer pays for his support. The period comes when the master is willing to run away from his slaves, or, in other words, to manumit them, and get rid of feeding, clothing, and housing them. He perceives that he can hire the peasant for less than it costs him to maintain the slave, and *therefore he manumits the slave*. The freedom conferred on the serf in Europe a few centuries ago, was a concession, not to the serf, but to the master. It was a change for the benefit of capital, not of labor. It was intended to place the master, the proprietor, the capitalist, in a better condition than before. There was nothing in society, as then constituted in any nation of Europe, that could by any possibility have produced a concession to the peasant. Who was he? what was he? that a change, in the fundamental laws of any government, should be made for *his* advantage, or by *his* advice? The change was intended for the benefit of the lord—for the advantage of the master only, was the serf converted into the "masterless slave." When he was made a free man, he was driven from a condition which he himself had chosen as a refuge from freedom. Gibbon relates that, on the establishment of the feudal system in Europe, the poor, the feeble, the timid, sought admission among the bondsmen of the powerful lords. They were glad to transfer to another, that right of property in themselves, which the abolitionists tell us cannot be alienated. When the nobles subsequently found them an incumbrance, they restored them to their previous condition—the condition of free laborers. Is that condition now, any better than it was, when the poor ran away from it, by enrolling themselves among the serfs of the nobles? In the increased and crowded population of Europe, is it easier for the laborer to win his bread by the sweat of his brow? Is it less difficult to procure clothes, lodgings, fuel? Is land more easy of rent? Does not every day afford evidence of the continued desire of the landholder to get rid of the manumitted serf—to drive off the cottar from his estate, and free himself from the remains of the servile incumbrance left upon his hands? It is true that the violence of the middle ages, which drove the feeble and the poor into slavery, exists no longer, but want, destitution, misery, starvation, constitute a motive quite as irresistible—hunger is as powerful as the sword. The laborer lives by work, but he cannot obtain it. The complaint of thousands continually, is, that they are not able to get employment. How happy would they be, to be always secure of it—to hold their employer bound never to dismiss his laborers, without finding for them another employer—to enjoy one of the benefits conferred by the condition

of the slave. He is always secure of employment, always, therefore, secure of subsistence. And to this condition, only call it by another name, we cannot but think that thousands of European operatives would rejoice to be brought.

Where, then, is the essential or important practical difference between the servitude of modern Europe, and American slavery? Except in the fancy of those, who compose new Eutopias, or imaginary Republics, a laboring class—a very large class who depend on daily labor for daily bread—must exist in every civilized state. In *one country* this laboring class is free, that is, he may seek his own master, and make his own contract. But want drives him to take the least possible wages that can sustain life. He is very often unable to obtain employment at all. Then he starves. He sleeps under hedges. To be able to get into a barn upon straw is a luxury. His wife and children suffer with him. If he falls sick, they perish together. In *another country*, the laborer is transferred by one employer to another—his contract is made for him. He is sure of employment, and therefore sure of subsistence. He never wanders about in pursuit of work. He has a fixed home, certain support, food, clothing, help when sick. "In periods of commercial revulsion and distress, in countries of free labor, the distress falls principally on the laborer. In those of slave labor, it falls almost exclusively on the employer. In the former, when a business becomes unprofitable, the employer dismisses his laborers, or lowers their wages. But with the latter, it is the very period at which he is least able to dismiss his laborers; and if he would suffer a farther loss, he cannot reduce their wages."* If with the free laborer, there be better chances for the few of superior mind to improve their condition, with the slave there is greater certainty, for the mass, of security from want and starvation. There are compensations in either condition of society, which makes it not easy to determine which best secures the greatest happiness to the laboring poor.

It is with good reason then, that Gov. Hammond affirms, "that slavery is an established and inevitable condition of human society." You may give it another name but the case of the laboring poor in countries of free labor, does not materially differ from that of the slave. The Marquis of Normandy, as quoted by Gov. Hammond, declares the English operatives "in effect slaves." They are more degraded physically, and morally, than our slaves." To prove this, and show that it is not a rhetorical flourish only, a number of passages are quoted by Hammond, from the reports of the commissioners appointed by parliament to investigate the condition of the operatives. We refer to his letters for a few of the cases of suffering, ignorance, and brutal degradation, which abound throughout England, and will inflict but one or two upon the reader. "I wish," says a Commissioner, "to call the attention of the Board to the pits about Brampton. The seams are so thin that several of them have only two feet headway, to all the working. They are worked altogether by boys from 8 to 12 years of age, on all fours, with a dogbelt and a chain. The passages being neither ironed nor wooded, are often an inch or two thick with mud. In Mr. Barus' pit, these poor boys have to drag the barrows with one cwt. of coal or slack 60 times a day 60 yards, and the empty barrows back without once straightening their backs." "Richard North, aged 16, went into the pit at 7—when he drew by the girdle and chain his skin was broken, and the blood ran down." "When they refused to draw they were beaten. In these pits, girls were at work, clad in nothing but their shifts, among naked men. In Liverpool, 40,000 persons live in cellars; in Manchester, 15,000. In England, 22,000 people dwell in barus, tents, and in the open air. According to Mr. O'Connell, there are now in Ireland alone 4,000,000 of paupers in rags without homes, 'living on potatoes when they can get them, and to whom a blanket is an unknown luxury.' D'Israeli, in a work of fiction it is true, but one professing to give a picture less horrible than the facts would justify, abounds in details of misery that are almost incredible. We refer our readers to the work, and particularly to the biographical notice of Mr. Devilsdust, the foundling pauper.

It is sufficiently evident from these accounts, that the condition of the English

* Harper's Memoir.

operative is not superior to that of the American slave. We have no such destitution and misery in the United States. Our slaves are better fed, better clothed, and certainly not more ignorant or immoral. We challenge comparison on this subject. Take for example the relative condition of the children of slave and operative. The very worst feature in the case of the laboring poor of England, is the miserable state of the children of tender years, of both sexes, working, under exposures which set all decency at defiance, and harnessed literally to their work. The child of a slave, to the age of twelve or thirteen, is as happy as perfect exemption from work and care can make him.

There is this essential difference, too, in the case of the English operative, and the African slave. The one has been degraded, by the increasing hardships of his situation, from a better condition; the other has been raised by slavery from a lower one—the worst features of English social life were not known two hundred years ago in England; Mr. Clarkson himself would hardly deny, that the African in America is a civilized and cultivated being, compared with the savage of the slave coast.

In reference to this suffering and degrading class of operatives, Chancellor Harper says, “If some superior being would impose on the laboring poor of any country—this as their unalterable condition—you shall be saved from the torturing anxiety concerning your own future support, and that of your children, which now pursues you through life, and haunts you in death—you shall be under the necessity of regular and healthful, though not excessive labor—in return you shall have the ample supply of your natural wants—you may follow the instinct of nature in becoming parents, without apprehending that this supply will fail yourselves, or your children—you shall be supported and relieved in sickness, and in old age, wear out the remains of existence among familiar scenes and associates, without being driven to beg, or to resort to the hard and miserable charity of a workhouse—you shall of necessity be temperate, and shall have neither the temptation or opportunity to commit great crimes, or practise the more destructive vices—how inappreciable would the boon be thought.” “Yet this is a very near approach to the condition of our slaves;”* and we confidently ask, whether the laboring millions of Great Britain would not joyfully accept a proposal from their landlords, permitting them to give their labor for life, to be ensured a dwelling, food, clothing, fire, and the support of their families at their death. What else is slavery but such an exchange? “May we not then say justly that we have less slavery, or more mitigated slavery than any other country in the civilized world.”†

The misfortune with the theorists and speculators on the subject of slavery is, that they compare the condition of the slave not with the laboring poor of their own or other countries, but with some imaginary state of society, where there is no excessive labor, no severe privation, no want, starvation, or wretchedness. “But theorists cannot control nature and bend her to their views,”‡ and the class marked by poverty, and hard work, and want, will continue to the end of time among all nations. Whether this class be in a better condition as serfs, or free laborers, is a question, which Chancellor Harper says no human sagacity can fairly solve.

To the several objections to slavery, made from various quarters, the writers to whom we have referred, give sound and satisfactory answers. It is said that the life of the slave is insecure. We challenge comparison, replies Chancellor Harper, and affirm, that with us there have been fewer murders of slaves, than of parents, children, apprentices, in societies where slavery does not exist. It is pretended that nations owning slaves are feeble in a military capacity, let us recur to the histories of Greece and Rome for the answer. We are supposed to be exposed to internal dangers—to the risk of insurrection and violence to person and property. Compare the condition of the Southern with that of the Northern States, or Great Britain—with the riots of Massachusetts, where helpless women were burnt out of their convent home at midnight—the ruthless violence of a like nature in Philadelphia—the anti-rent disturbances in New York, where law and order have been trampled under foot for two years, and the Governor and the judges talk mincingly of the hardships of the

* Harper's Memoir.

† Harper.

‡ Hammond.

anti-renters, who are obliged—poor innocents—to live on leased land, and not on fee simple estates, contrary to the genius of our institutions—or the infamous Mormon and anti Mormon troubles, burnings, and murders which disgrace Illinois—or the disorders of Ireland, where one man at the head of the populace virtually governs, conflagrations and murders are perpetrated with impunity throughout the land, and government looks helplessly and hopelessly on—compare all this with the unbroken quiet of the Southern States. It is asserted that the slave is the object of oppression and tyranny. If a laborer in England steals a lamb, or entraps the game kept for the *sport* of his employers, he is imprisoned, or transported; if a slave with us robs his master of a sheep, he is punished with a few lashes; if he kills his game, he has an unlimited privilege to eat it. But the slave is whipped—subject to a degrading punishment. So also are the sailors and soldiers of England. Are they less sensitive than the slave? Is the lash administered with a gentler temper, or a weaker arm in the navy, or army? Shall the tar be brought to the gangway and the cat for his offences, and the slave go free? Is the boy, or apprentice, degraded in England by a whipping from his master? It is very idle to dispute about mere modes of punishment. All are evils—unavoidable evils. Each nation selects that which is deemed most conducive to the end in view. Between whipping, imprisonment, transportation, who can authoritatively decide? As to the severity with which the lash is applied, it may confidently be asserted that nothing, to which the slave is exposed, is at all comparable to the merciless inflictions to which English sailors and soldiers have been frequently condemned.

We have remarked that in his social, moral, and religious condition, the African is immeasurably improved since his transfer to America from his own country, and this is the true point of comparison. From an idolater, according to the most brutal forms of the most stupid of all superstition, he has been converted into a worshipper of the true God. From an ignorant and idle barbarian, he has been changed into an industrious, orderly, quiet, and useful laborer. Have the philanthropists, false or true, done half as much for the African? Have they done any thing for him, but to make him discontented with a condition which is the best he ever knew—the only one in which he can ever improve—that of subjection to a superior and more intelligent race. Whether the system of education, which the African enjoys among us, may not be modified and made better; whether it may not be divested of *some remains of colonial rudeness*, is a question for those only to decide, to whose government Providence has entrusted him; but this is certain, it is the best which the negro race has ever yet been permitted to enjoy.

In considering slavery as a question of political economy, we have so far regarded it, as it influences the well being of the slave only. We have not adverted to some of the consequences of the system of free labor on the situation of the employer or capitalist. It has been said that the manumission of the slave in Europe was a concession to the lord, and not to the serf; that it relieved the master from the support of the slave, when the work of the last was no longer profitable. In other words; it was perceived by the dominant class, that free labor was cheaper than slave labor, and *therefore* the slave was made free. But to this gain on the part of the master, time has gradually attached certain counter-balancing evils, which may make it doubtful whether he has really reaped any material advantage from the change. A pauper class is the necessary consequence of a free labor class, and the poor soon become numerous and destitute. It is not quite possible in a christian country to see men starve in the streets of a great city, as in London for example, without some effort to aid them. But this must happen to the free laborer who has no work, and therefore no bread, if some provision is not made for his support. A poor tax must be levied, work-houses must be built, and the expenses of managing them must be paid. Enormous sums of money are thus forced from the reluctant master. The number of paupers in Great Britain, by the census of 1841, was 3,522,000, to say nothing of the partially destitute. The paupers of Ireland alone, according to Mr. O'Connell, are now 4,000,000. The poor tax of 1839 was £4,400,000—a sum nearly equal to the whole revenue of the United States.

There is no part of the system of English society, about which their statesmen and

writers have so differed and disputed, as their poor laws. It is difficult to say whether they are most hateful to the tax paying landholder, or the alms-supported pauper; whether the rate-receiver, or the poor-house commissioner, be the most detested object; whether the beadle, or charity boy—Mr. Bumble, or Oliver Twist—be the happiest illustration of the blessings of the system.

It would seem then, that the great proprietors and capitalist have not altogether escaped the burthen of supporting the old, the sick, and the infirm laborer—that however reluctant, they are still compelled to contribute to this purpose. They do so in a way more onerous to themselves, and less acceptable to the laboring poor. It may be well doubted whether, if the poor-laws and poor-rates had been foreseen, the landholders of England would have been so ready to exchange the dear labor of the serf, for the cheap labor of the freeman.

When to this continued and increasing evil is added the danger to which property is exposed from the despair of the starving laborer, it is very questionable, whether the European master has improved his own condition by the manumission of the serf. It has been shown that to the serf himself, the change has been no sure blessing. As a general question then, of political economy, or civil government, it is by no means certain whether slavery, or free labor, be the most useful element in civil society.

Such is the view sketched concisely and imperfectly from the writings at the head of our article, of slavery as one of the conditions of civilized society—one of the classes, or castes, into which the population of a great nation must be necessarily distributed. You may call the mass of poor laborers what you will, but destitution, and suffering, and hard labor will be the attendants on poverty. There are some evils accompanying the condition of the free laborer, there are others peculiar to that of the slave; which may predominate, as a general question it is not easy to decide. But whatever may be the truth in reference to the laborers of other countries, where there is no broad or marked line of discrimination between the rich and the poor, except what wealth or want may create, a new element enters into the calculation of advantages and evils incident to the several conditions of slavery, or free labor, when the question refers, as it does with us, to two distinct, heterogeneous races, who can never unite. If the two races so brought together are whites and blacks, the white will not endure the union—the happiness of the African is best secured in bondage under the superior race. It is in this condition only, that he can enjoy or partake the advantages of a high state of civilization.

The negro never originated a civilization of his own. In Africa he is found always and every where, in a state of the rudest barbarism. In our own day the folly of France has enabled him to prove, that after having been trained to a high degree of efficient industry and improvement, he relapses, when left to himself, into hopeless savagism; and England is trying a series of experiments, to enable him to establish the same truth in her West India Islands. If then he is ever to enjoy the advantages physical, moral, and religious, of a highly civilized society, it must be in permanent connection with a race superior to his own.

But with such a race he cannot hope to live as an equal. He never did from the beginning of the world. He never can. The nonsense of the abolitionists about amalgamation is as stupid as it is nauseous. It violates the common instincts of our nature. Mr. Tappan himself would shun a negro son-in-law, and Mr. Alvan Stewart avoid the odors of an African spouse. The most careless observer of events will be continually struck at the difficulty with which different tribes, or nations, mix and combine, even when they approach to physical and intellectual equality. In England they still talk of the Norman, and Saxon, and Celt. But where one race is decidedly an inferior one, greatly an inferior one—a race of slaves in all ages—never reaching to a high condition of moral, or intellectual culture; always ignorant, always savage; in the eye of the white, disgusting from color and features; to talk of a mixture, is to exhibit an ignorance of our nature, worse than that of the most arrant clothopper, who selects his sheep and his swine from superior breeds. The stupidity, indeed, of the ranters for abolition, is one of the aggravating points of the annoyance to which they subject us. It would be an almost ludicrous death to be brayed out of existence by a chorus of donkeys.

equality. The consequences of manumission to the blacks, in driving them from employment, and rapidly lessening their number, are so obvious as to arrest the attention of the transient observer. "The colored population (says Mr. Lyell*) are protected against the free competition of the white emigrants, with whom, if they were once liberated, they could no longer successfully contend." "Experience has proved in the Northern States, that emancipation immediately checks the increase of the colored population, and causes the relative number of whites to augment very rapidly." "Before the influx of white laborers, the coloured race will give way, and it will require the watchful care of the philanthropist, whether in the North or South, to prevent them from being thrown out of employment, and reduced to destitution." A moments reflection however would convince Mr. Lyell, that no effort of philanthropy could overcome the influence of those causes—the *leges legum* of which, civil institutions are themselves the mere effects—by which the fate of the African race would be decided. We might deplore that fate, we could not change it. Has philanthropy changed or even retarded that of the Indian tribes of North America?

But the disadvantage resulting to the manumitted black, from his marked inferiority, and inability to engage in competition with the white man in the ordinary pursuits of life, is a small evil, compared with the infinitely greater one which would perpetually threaten him, of actual collision between the two colours. Various causes might lead to this—the depredation of the starving negro—the ambition of aspiring men of his own race, or unprincipled and reckless demagogues of the other,—hatred for supposed wrongs,—the discontent arising from real inferiority. If from these, or any other causes, a resort to arms between the two races should occur, then the sure and speedy destruction of the unhappy African must be the consequence. The abolitionists, with their characteristic stupidity and malignity, seem desirous to hasten the conflict, as they profess to augur victory to the object of their sympathy; but no man capable of thinking would for a moment be in doubt as to the result.

At the settlement of this country, according to Catlin's calculation, there were 6,000,000 of red men scattered over the Continent. There are now 1,400,000. They have disappeared before the indomitable race of Caucasian origin. But if the red men of North America, numerous as they were—brave, persevering, resolute of purpose, and trained to the art of war, were unable to resist the steady, determined onset of the few, feeble, scattered colonies, spread out along a thousand miles of coast, what hope could there be for the sluggish, timid, unskilled African, in a contest with these colonists—numerous, bold, energetic, and practised in arms, and stimulated to fierce indignation, by the circumstances of the conflict, and the nature of the foe? It would be a war of extermination to the black. Such is the conclusion of Lord Brougham.

In illustrating the peculiarly amiable character of our English friend, and the amusing blunders into which his love of himself, and his hatred for his neighbors, sometimes lead him, we omitted the most ludicrous example which has met our notice. Lord Sydenham, when Governor-general of Canada, wrote a series of letters to his colleagues at home. The letters are libels on the Americans, after the approved English model. They are so delightfully abusive, that it never seems to have occurred to his friends, that they were also very silly. They have accordingly been published, and are religiously believed in by nine out of ten among their readers in England. We will give only one of the many pleasant passages which abound in the Sydenham correspondence, and which happens to be connected with our subject. The Americans, says this nobleman, are "such a set of braggadocios, that their public men must submit to the claims of their extravagant vanity." Then in another place, he says, "if they drive us into a war, *the blacks in the South will soon settle all that part of the Union*; and in the North, I feel sure we can lick them to their heart's content."—a pleasant specimen this of the genuine John Bull—of what N. G. Willis calls the perfect thoroughbred. He is abusing the Americans for braggadocios, and their public men for submitting to the vanity of the people, and in the next sentence exhibits a sample of the most farcical bluster, and convinces us that he himself had

been filled so brim-full of the silliest Canadian vanities, as to believe that the blue noses could *lick* the Northern, and the blacks *settle* the Southern States—the settling on which the amiable Governor-general relies with so much complacency, being, of course, something like that of St. Domingo. This *licking* and *settling* is almost as ridiculous as Alvan Stewart's *habeas corpus* case in Utica, when Mr. Muny's old negro woman was frightened almost to death at the prospect of being made a free laborer—or the similar affair of Dr. Hudson at Northampton, where the *habeas-corpus*ed slave brought an action for false imprisonment against the poor philanthropist—or Mr. Hoar's solemn question to the Massachusetts Legislature, in his account of the mission to the South, when he gravely asks whether the States are all conquered provinces of South Carolina—or Mr. Clarkson's playing the part of Gregory the VII.; issuing his bulls to the good people of the United States, and denouncing the errors of omission, and commission perpetrated by the framers of the Federal Constitution—or Col. Mitchel's late work, which proves to the satisfaction of the English public, that Napoleon was a dolt and a coward.

We had no intention, however to dwell on Lord Sydenham's nonsense, but adverted to the passage merely for the purpose of introducing the remarks upon it of a much abler and more distinguished man. "Lord Sydenham, says the celebrated ex-Chancellor, is thoughtless enough to view with a *kind of exultation* the prospect of a negro insurrection, as a consequence of the United States daring to wage war with England. Misguided, short sighted man! and ignorant, oh, profoundly ignorant of the things that belong to the peace and the happiness of either color in the new world! A negro revolt in our islands, *where the whites are a handful among their sable brethren, might prove fatal to European life*, but the African, at least, would be secure as far as security would be derived from the successful shedding of blood. But on the continent, where the numbers of the two colors are evenly balanced,* and all the arms are in the white man's hands, who but the *bitterest enemy* of the unhappy slaves could bear to contemplate their wretchedness in the attempt by violence to shake of their chains." Yet this is the wretchedness which the pretended friends of the negro in England and in America, not only bear to contemplate, but greedily seek to bring about—let it come exclaims the Senator of Quincy in the ecstasy of anticipated enjoyment—let it come repeats the philanthropist of Utica, who entertains his guests on alternate courses of free-labor sugars† and abolition prints, and discusses, with the same coolness, an ice cream, and the cutting of Southern throats.‡ But we of the South regard the catastrophe deprecated by Lord Bougham with horror, and believing it to be the certain consequence of the abolition of slavery in the United States, we say to the abolitionists, for the sake of the negro, cease from your machinations—setting aside every other argument and reason against your projects, this single one is conclusive—there is but one alternative for the African in America—he must live a slave, or from causes which no human power or influence can control, he must cease to live at all.

Our objections, therefore, to the manumission of the blacks, may be stated like those of Mr. Grosvenor, to the abolition of the slave trade. One of them is, that it would destroy the negroes; it is unnecessary to give any more.

To one then who is content to view the affairs of human life in their chequered and sad reality, and is not deluded by visions of imaginary equality and happiness never yet enjoyed among men, the condition of slavery, as one of the permanently established conditions of society, presents no such hideous features as are conjured up in

* Lord Brougham does not state the case with all its strength. In the slave States the number of whites to blacks is as five to three.

† Nothing can be more inconsistent with their professed good will to the negro, than the refusal of the abolitionists to consume slave-grown Sugar, for although the negro is always sure of food, clothing, etc., his enjoyments are materially promoted by the prosperous condition of the master. The condition of slave and master is indeed the only one securing an intimate union between the interest of labor and capital. In England the object is manifest—to give a monopoly of the sugar market to her own colonies. In America, our abolition party, in their blind imitation of Exeter hall, have taken a position precisely the reverse of that of England—the American party discourage their own country's production, for the benefit of foreigners.

‡ This gentlemen on his supper tables, displays, among the dishes, pictures of imaginary doings of masters and slaves, with whips, chains, handcuffs, etc., to improve the appetite of his guests.

the fancies of real and pretended philanthropists. It is the position in which it has pleased Divine Providence to place the poor and the feeble in all ages, and almost all countries, which he has recognized and established as a form of social life, and, for the regulation of which, he has prescribed rules that, if duly regarded, secure to the slave all the benefits physical, moral, and religious, which the laboring poor can ever hope to command.

When compared with free labor, it will be found that each condition has its benefits and its evils to the whole community—to the destitute and to the rich, the laborer and the lord; that whatever may be true as to the superior advantages of free over slave labor in other countries, where no radical difficulty prevents the manumitted serf from melting into the mass of the dominant people, there is no choice left us in America where the slave is an inferior race, of different color, with whom the master will never unite; that the cultivation of the South requires the preservation of the only species of labor which she is able to command, and, without which, our fields would be abandoned; that to the slave himself, his present condition is not only the best, as securing to him advantages, comforts, enjoyments, which the African never before possessed, but it is his only security from the operation of circumstances, which would either gradually wear away his kind, or suddenly extinguish it in blood.

These are the conclusions to which our argument conducts us, and we leave it with every well meaning man to determine, how he can with a clear conscience, lend his aid, to an agitation which seeks to bring about by violence a catastrophe so disastrous to society, so injurious to the master, so destructive to the slave? Can he—dare he meddle with a question, with which he has no immediate concern, against the protests of those most interested, and with the almost certainty that his interference will produce incalculable evil to the object of his care.

W. G.





Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

